DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 360 354 TM 020 239

AUTHOR Impara, James C.
TITLE Joint Committee on Competency Standards in Student Assessment for Educational Administrators Update: Assessment Survey Results.
PUB DATE Apr 93
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education (Atlanta, GA, April 13-15, 1993).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Administrator Responsibility; *Administrators; *Competence; *Educational Assessment; Elementary Secondary Education; *Job Skills; *Knowledge Level; National Surveys; Principals; Questionnaires; Sampling; *Standards; Student Evaluation; Test Use
IDENTIFIERS Assessment Literacy; Open Ended Questions; Standard Setting

ABSTRACT

The American Association of School Administrators, the National Association of Elementary School Principals, the National Association of Secondary School Principals, and the National Council on Measurement in Education are cooperating on a project to develop competency standards for educational administrators in the area of student assessment. A national survey of educational administrators was conducted as part of this effort to determine the frequency and importance of student assessment tasks that they perform and their self-perceptions of the level of knowledge and skills they have and need in various assessment areas. In the first stage of the survey, a small number of administrators responded to an open-ended questionnaire to identify assessment-related tasks and the skills and knowledge associated with them. A target sample was chosen from each cooperating organization, and responses were received from almost 1,700 administrators. Different categories of administrators have different assessment responsibilities, but every task was performed at least once by a modest percentage from each organization. Overall, the skills and knowledge needed for these administrators were very similar, in spite of the differing levels of task emphasis. Nine tables present survey results, including rating the skills and knowledge requirements by their importance. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

JOINT COMMITTEE ON COMPETENCY STANDARDS IN STUDENT ASSESSMENT FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATORS UPDATE: ASSESSMENT SURVEY RESULTS

Prepared by

James C. Impara
University of Nebraska - Lincoln

ED360354

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

JAMES C. IMPARA

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TM020239

Joint Committee on Competency Standards in Student Assessment for Educational Administrators Update: Assessment Survey Results[1]

Prepared by
James C. Impara
University of Nebraska - Lincoln

The American Association of School Administrators (AASA), the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) and the National Council on Measurement in Education (NCME) are cooperating on a project to develop competency standards for educational administrators in the area of student assessment. Members of AASA are principally superintendents and most members of the other two organizations are principals at the respective levels.

Work has been completed on the three project tasks undertaken to provide information to assist in development of the standards. These tasks were:

1. Conduct a literature review to learn what work had been done relevant to competency standards in student assessment for educational administrators and to obtain models of standards that might prove useful.
2. Piggyback on a national survey of teachers in a "Teacher Assessment Literacy" grant to assess educational administrators' knowledge level on the content of the Teacher Competency Standards (American Federation of Teachers, National Council on Measurement in Education, National Education Association, 1990).
3. Conduct a national survey of educational administrators to determine the frequency and importance of student assessment tasks they perform and their self perceptions of the level of

[1]Presented at the Annual Meeting of NCME, April, 1993, Atlanta, GA

knowledge and skills they have and need in various assessment areas.

Literature Review and Piggyback survey

Outcomes of the first two tasks were reported on at last year's NCME meeting. In summary, the review of the literature identified numerous relevant articles and sources of related information. It resulted in identifying several personal contacts with other agencies and personnel who are interested in this activity.

The survey of administrators (and teachers) on their knowledge of the concepts associated with the Competency Standards for Teachers found that administrators tended to be more knowledgeable on the topics examined than were teachers and a larger proportion of administrators had received training in tests and measurements. *The Journal of School Leadership* will publish the results in an upcoming issue.

National Survey of Educational Administrators

Methods

The national survey of educational administrators has also been completed and that is the topic of this paper. The second survey was conducted in two stages. In the first stage a small number of administrators from each organization responded to an open-ended questionnaire that asked what tasks they perform involving student assessment information and what skills and knowledge they need to perform these tasks. Their responses formed the basis for closed-response items administered to a larger, national sample of the membership of each of the three administrator organizations.

To help make sure the standards reflect what is currently happening in schools a questionnaire was sent to a random sample of the membership in each organization. A target of 1,200 responses was set with the expectation of receiving approximately 400 from each organization. This was done to have approximately equal numbers across groups for making group comparisons and to feel comfortable making generalizations back to the membership (using appropriate caution given the volunteer nature of responding to any mailed questionnaire). Historically, both AASA and NASSP have received approximately 40% returns from single mailing, anonymous questionnaires while NAESP reported only a 20% response from such survey practices. To achieve the target number of responses 4,000 questionnaires were sent out to a random sample of 1,000 members of AASA and NASSP and to 2,000

TM 020239
TM 020

members of NAESP. Because the NAESP also indicated that their membership tended to be lower in urban areas, it was decided to systematically over sample in those communities to insure an adequate response. It was believed that principals in urban areas may have different responses that would those in other locations.

The questionnaire consisted of 37 items. The initial 25 items asked about the frequency with which certain assessment related tasks are performed and importance of the tasks to the job. The frequency scale was a five point scale ranging from one (labeled "rarely") to five (labeled "often"). Only the scale endpoints were named. There was also a listing of 13 skills and knowledge (items 25 through 37) that were rated in terms of what the respondents have and need in their jobs. The "have" and the "need" scale were both five point scales with only endpoint labeled as "low" and "high" (one and five, respectively). The items and the mean responses to each item from each organization are shown in Table 1.

There was also a section at the end of the questionnaire that asked the respondents to provide certain background and demographic information. These items included: the respondent's position (principal, superintendent), setting (public/private school), location (rural/suburban/urban), training in measurement (college courses and inservice) and the recency of that training, self-rating of knowledge of student assessment topics in relation to others in similar jobs, level of interest in and preferred methods of learning more about student assessment, and experience as an administrator. A space for comments was also provided.

The questionnaire was piloted with a small number of members from each organization to insure the tasks, knowledge and skills were actually performed by educational administrators at the various levels[2]. It was also pilot tested using 24 students in a graduate course in educational administration at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

Results

Almost 1,700 administrators responded to the single mailing of this survey. Budget limitations prevented any follow-up of nonrespondents. The survey was completely anonymous except for individuals who requested a copy of the results. The overall response frequency from AASA was 473 (47.3%), from NASSP: 376 (37.6%), and from NAESP: 836 (41.8%)[3]. As shown in Table 2, the three tasks performed most often by administrators in the different organizations were:

AASA:
Being aware of the changes in testing and assessment practices,
Communicating testing and assessment results to the media and general public, and
Evaluating a school or system assessment or testing program.

NAESP & NASSP (The three top ranked tasks were the same for both organizations.):
Conducting teacher observations while the teacher is doing assessment activities such as oral reading or class discussion,
Monitoring student performance, and
Evaluating student performance using student achievement data.

On the other end of the scale, the administrators reported that some of the tasks were performed with relatively low frequency (see Table 3):

AASA:
Scheduling testing ,
Participating in Individual Educational Plan (IEP) development, and
Placing/grouping students in classes.

NAESP:
Evaluating teachers or administrators using student achievement data,
Communicating testing and assessment results to the media and general public, and
Creating a budget for testing.

NASSP:
Conducting professional development programs on assessment,
Training teachers to develop or use tests/assessments, and
Creating a budget for testing.

Table 4 shows the tasks rated highest in importance. For the AASA members the tasks performed with the highest frequency are also rated as highest in importance. For principals, however, there was some variation

[2] A copy of the questionnaire can be obtained by calling or writing: James C. Impara, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 135 Bancroft Hall, Lincoln, NE 68588-0348.

[3] These are overall number of responses. The frequency of response varies by item because each item was omitted by at least one member of each organization.

inservice in combination (9.5%), college course (6%) or some combination of methods (3%).

When asked the general question about their perception of how their knowledge rates in comparison with others in their same job 51% said about average, 35% said they were above average. Only seven percent indicated their knowledge was below the average when compared with others in their job.

Demographically the respondents were very experienced - over 60% had more than 12 years experience as an administrator and only 10% had fewer than five years experience. Almost 97% worked in the public schools. The superintendents and secondary principals were distributed similarly across the rural/suburban/urban categories. The superintendents were 42% rural, 47% suburban and 11% urban, while the secondary principals were 42% rural, 41% suburban and 17% urban. The elementary principals were slightly more urban (due to a systematic over-sampling of the urban group to insure adequate representation of members in that category). The distribution of elementary principals was 36% rural, 41% suburban and 23% urban.

Discussion

It is certainly not surprising that different categories of administrators tend to have different responsibilities. Superintendents perform different tasks than principals. Of interest was that every task listed was rated as being performed often by at least a modest percentage of respondents from each organization. Even the task rated lowest in overall frequency by superintendents (Place/group students in class) was performed "often" by three percent of them. Similarly the task least often performed by principals (Create a budget for testing) was performed often by over five percent of both the elementary and secondary principals.

Every task was performed "often" by some number of individuals in each of the administrative positions in the sample. Some respondents from AASA indicated that many of the items had no relevance for them because they had no students under their direct jurisdiction (they were regional rather than district superintendents or they were finance officers or had similar responsibilities). These individuals, however, represent a small minority of educational administrators and their responses have little influence on the overall nature of the findings that the tasks listed were those performed at all

7

levels of administration for administrators who have children in their jurisdiction.

The ratings for "have" and "need" for the thirteen skills and knowledge were much more common across the different categories of administrators. We concluded that even though superintendents and principals have different levels of task emphasis, the skills and knowledge they have and need to perform these tasks are very similar.

Moreover, the ratings of skills and knowledge indicate that while there is variation in the level of skills and knowledge on hand and needed, that most respondents felt a need for high levels of skills and knowledge. The item rated lowest for "have" was "Know how to design and conduct a performance assessment" (ranked lowest by superintendents and secondary principals and next lowest by elementary principals). This item was still rated "high" in the need column by 18%, 22% and 28% of the superintendents, secondary and elementary principals, respectively. The lowest rated items in the "need" category were classified as a "high" need by over 16% of the respondents in each organization.

On almost every item, the skill needed rating was higher than the corresponding have rating for the skill. Every skill and knowledge had a mean rating of over 3.0 on the five point response scale for both the "have" and "need" scales. For virtually every item the rating for need exceeded the rating for have. This suggests some directions for the design of both pre and inservice programs in measurement for educational administrators. The nature of the tasks performed by the different categories of educational administrators suggests the nature of examples and contexts in which these skills and knowledge come into play.

In terms of setting competency standards for educational administrators, we have a great deal of information about what they do, how important they perceive those tasks to be and what skills and knowledge they need to perform these tasks. We are much closer to being able to design a realistic and practical set of competency standards that will be relevant to the job educational administrators do.

8

between the frequency ratings and the importance ratings. For both groups of principals, the two most frequent tasks (Conducting teacher observations..., and Monitoring student performance) were also rated as among the most important tasks performed. In addition to these two tasks, "Participating in evaluating instructional methods and materials" was rated as one of the most important tasks.

The tasks rated lowest in importance were the same as those rated lowest in frequency with one exception (see Table 5). For the NASSP respondents "Using student test scores to determine eligibility" replaced "Creating a budget for testing" at the low end of the importance scale.

The questionnaire also sought information on the degree to which the respondents have and need thirteen assessment related areas of skills and knowledge. As shown in Table 6, the administrators rate themselves as having the following skills and knowledge:

AASA, NAESP and **NASSP** (order varies, but the following items were all the top three):

Knowing terminology found in reports from standardized tests, such as percentile scores, grade equivalents,

Knowing the purposes of different kinds of testing, e.g., achievement, IQ, diagnostic, and

Understanding the concepts associated with testing, e.g., reliability, validity.

(The first two of these items were also rated as those most needed -- shown in Table 8. The third most needed was: Understanding the appropriate linkage between curriculum content and different kinds of tests).

Table 7 indicates the skills rated lowest on the "have" scale for each organization as:

AASA:

Knowing the mechanics of writing teacher-made tests; understanding the guidelines for test construction,

Reconciling apparently conflicting assessment information when making a decision about a student, and

Knowing how to design and conduct a performance assessment.

(As shown in Table 9, these skills were also rated as the least needed.)

NAESP:

Knowing the mechanics of writing teacher-made tests; understanding the guidelines for test construction,

Recognizing when tests/assessments are designed consistent with accepted guidelines and standards,

Knowing how to design and conduct a performance assessment, and

(Among these three items, those related to knowing the mechanics of writing teacher-made tests and to knowing how to design and conduct a performance assessment were among the three least needed skills. The other least needed skill was: Having a basic working knowledge of measurement theory. See Table 9.)

NASSP:

Applying measurement theory to practice,

Knowing how to design and conduct a performance assessment, and

Recognizing when tests/assessments are designed consistent with accepted guidelines and standards.

(The latter two items were among the three lowest rated in the need category along with: Having a basic working knowledge of measurement theory. See Table 9.)

We also learned that the vast majority of the respondents from these organizations have had some exposure to training in tests and measurements, either in a college course or an inservice experience. Overall only 3% had not had a course with some content in tests and measurement, while approximately 35% had not had any inservice experience at all. For most respondents their course work is not very recent (for most over six years has passed since receiving any coursework), but slightly over 50% have had some inservice training within the past four years. Even though many have had relatively recent inservice training in some area of measurement, only four percent indicated they had no interest in obtaining more training. The remaining respondents were either somewhat or very interested in receiving more training in measurement.

The outstanding preference of method of receiving more exposure to measurement was professional development experiences (on-site inservice training programs). Over 70% gave professional development as their preference as compared with self-contained video (10.5%), video and

References

American Federation of Teachers, National Council on Measurement in Education & National Education Association (AFT, NCME & NEA) 1990. Standards for teacher competence in educational assessment of students. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 9(4), 30-32.

Table 1. Questionnaire Items and Organizational Means

Item number & Description:	Mean Frequency			Importance		
Tasks (Items 1 - 24)	AASA	NAESP	NASSP	AASA	NAESP	NASSP
1. Participate in IEP development in which test scores and other assessment results are presented.	1.51	3.59	2.78	1.94	3.43	2.81
2. Use student test scores to determine eligibility for special programs (not special education) such as Chapter 1.	1.89	3.21	2.47	2.25	3.20	2.57
3. Evaluate student performance using student achievement data.	3.01	3.71	3.39	3.41	3.84	3.56
4. Conduct teacher observations while the teacher is undertaking assessment activities, e.g., oral reading, class discussion.	2.16	4.02	4.00	2.67	4.30	4.26
5. Place/group students in classes.	1.47	3.55	2.92	1.80	3.71	3.21
6. Evaluate school or system assessment or testing programs.	3.55	3.10	2.93	3.99	3.69	3.46
7. Monitor student performance.	2.97	3.95	3.86	3.41	4.25	4.09
8. Evaluate teachers or school administrators using student achievement data.	2.49	2.22	2.45	2.88	2.55	2.90
9. Communicate test/ assessment information to teachers or administrators.	3.31	3.60	3.24	3.61	3.83	3.58
10. Conference with parents and others about student assessment (grades, test scores, homework, etc.).	1.98	3.40	3.33	2.37	3.76	3.67
11. Communicate test/ assessment results to the media and general public.	3.56	2.18	3.36	3.88	2.63	2.81
12. Interpret test scores for others, e.g., colleague administrators, teachers.	2.87	2.98	2.48	3.11	3.18	2.79

Table 1. Questionnaire Items and Organizational Means (Continued)

Item number & Description: Tasks (Items 1 - 24)	Mean Frequency AASA	NAESP	NASSP	Importance AASA	NAESP	NASSP
13. Participate in curriculum development activities which match student performance/ achievement with learning objectives.	2.91	3.36	3.13	3.36	3.93	3.70
14. Develop intervention procedures which identify strengths and weaknesses of teachers and students.	2.54	3.49	3.20	3.04	4.00	3.74
15. Train teachers to develop or use tests/ assessments.	2.04	2.52	2.19	2.65	3.21	2.90
16. Help teachers develop alternate assessment strategies.	2.30	3.07	2.75	2.89	3.78	3.48
17. Participate in evaluating instructional methods and materials.	2.82	3.57	3.31	3.22	4.01	3.82
18. Conduct professional development programs on assessment.	2.43	2.44	2.25	2.91	3.08	2.97
19. Schedule testing.	1.88	2.74	2.75	2.01	2.77	2.78
20. Create a budget for testing.	3.40	1.70	1.95	3.47	1.92	2.16
21. Develop a plan for assessment implementation for your building or school system.	3.28	2.68	2.57	3.72	3.22	3.11
22. Read the current literature on assessment.	3.46	6.48	3.13	3.65	3.85	3.51
23. Create an awareness of issues related to assessment such as gender, ethnicity, equity.	3.25	3.02	2.81	3.50	3.52	3.22
24. Be aware of changes in testing and assessment practices.	3.61	3.55	3.16	3.89	4.00	3.66

Table 1. Questionnaire Items and Organizational Means (Continued)

Item number & Description: Skills /Know. (Items 25 - 37)	Mean Frequency AASA	NAESP	NASSP	Importance AASA	NAESP	NASSP
25. Know terminology found in reports from standardized tests, such as grade equivalent scores, percentile scores. and percentile bands.	4.05	4.16	3.83	4.04	4.28	4.03
26. Understand the appropriate linkage between curriculum content and different kinds of tests.	3.78	3.70	3.45	4.05	4.20	3.97
27. Know the mechanics of writing teacher-made test; understand guidelines for test construction.	3.22	3.36	3.43	3.23	3.79	3.70
28. Know how to design and conduct a performance assessment.	3.08	3.13	3.06	3.36	3.80	3.63
29. Recognize when tests/ assessments are designed consistent with accepted guidelines and standards.	3.37	3.27	3.16	3.65	3.86	3.69
30. Understand the concepts associated with testing, e.g., reliability, validity.	3.99	3.73	3.67	3.93	3.89	3.86
31. Understand when alternate (non-traditional) assessment techniques are appropriate.	3.57	3.72	3.43	3.80	4.14	3.91
32. Reconcile apparently conflicting assessment information when making a decision about a student.	3.21	3.66	3.38	3.13	4.12	3.81
33. Understand variables that effect the valid interpretation of test results, e.g., student characteristics, curriculum match, test length.	3.55	3.65	3.29	3.56	4.00	3.69
34. Understand the role of test data in student grading and personnel evaluation.	3.72	3.71	3.48	3.66	3.69	3.59

Table 1. Questionnaire Items and Organizational Means (Continued)

Item number & Description:	Mean Frequency			Importance		
Skills /Know. (Items 25 - 37)	AASA	NAESP	NASSP	AASA	NAESP	NASSP
35. Have a basic working knowledge of measurement theory.	3.69	3.44	3.39	3.66	3.69	3.59
36. Know the purposes of different kinds of esting, e.g., achievement, IQ, diagnostic.	4.17	4.18	3.86	4.00	4.15	4.01
37. Apply assessment/ measurement theory to practice.	3.48	3.50	3.26	3.67	3.95	3.73

Table 2. Three Most Frequently Performed Tasks by Organizational Affiliation

Item number & Task (Mean Response)	Response Percent 1	2	3	4	5
AASA (N=473)	**Rarely**				**Often**
24. Be aware of changes in testing and assessment practices. (3.61)	4.1	9.9	28.3	36.5	21.2
11. Communicate test /assessment results to the media and general public. (3.56)	6.2	12.0	25.2	32.9	23.7
6. Evaluate school or system assessment or testing programs. (3.55)	5.4	10.6	29.7	31.9	22.4
NASSP (N=376)					
4. Conduct teacher observations while the teacher is undertaking assessment activities, e.g., oral reading, class discussion. (4.00)	2.1	5.6	22.4	29.6	40.3
7. Monitor student performance. (3.86)	3.2	6.4	22.2	37.2	31.0
3. Evaluate student performance using student achievement data. (3.39)	5.9	15.3	29.8	31.9	17.2
NAESP (N=836)					
7. Monitor student performance. (3.98)					
4. Conduct teacher observations while the teacher is undertaking assessment activities, e.g., oral reading, class discussion. (3.50)	1.6 4.0	6.6 5.1	23.9 17.7	30.9 31.2	37.0 42.1
3. Evaluate student performance using student achievement data. (3.44)	2.5	10.2	27.8	32.4	27.0

Table 3. Three Tasks Performed Least Frequently by Organizational Affiliation

Item number & Task (Mean Response)	Response Percent 1	2	3	4	5
AASA (N=473)	**Low**				**High**
19. Schedule testing. (1.83)	63.9	11.7	8.7	9.1	6.7
1. Participate in IEP development in which test scores and other assessment results are presented. (1.51)	72.9	12.3	8.6	3.0	3.2
5. Place/group students in classes. (1.47)	76.6	11.5	3.9	4.5	3.5
NASSP (N=376)					
15. Train teachers to develop or use tests/assessments. (2.52)	35.8	26.5	23.8	10.7	3.2
18. Conduct professional development programs on assessment. (2.44)	35.0	25.7	24.6	8.8	5.9
20. Create a budget for testing. (1.70)	54.7	16.6	13.9	8.8	5.9
NAESP (N=836)					
8. Evaluate teachers or school administrators using student achievement data. (2.45)	41.5	21.0	18.9	11.5	7.0
11. Communicate test /assessment results to the media and general public. (2.36)	37.5	24.9	23.5	10.4	3.7
20. Create a budget for testing. (1.95)	64.4	15.5	10.7	4.0	5.4

17

Table 4. Three Tasks Identified as Most Important by Organizational Affiliation

Item number & Task (Mean Response)	Response Percent 1	2	3	4	5
AASA (N=473)	**Rarely**				**Often**
6. Evaluate school or system assessment or testing programs. (3.59)	3.5	4.1	19.4	36.1	36.9
24. Be aware of changes in testing and assessment practices. (3.89)	2.4	6.7	21.6	38.2	31.1
11. Communicate test /assessment results to the media and general public. (3.88)	4.8	5.4	20.5	36.6	33.7
NASSP (N=376)					
4. Conduct teacher observations while the teacher is undertaking assessment activities, e.g., oral reading, class discussion. (4.26)	1.6	2.9	14.7	29.1	51.7
7. Monitor student performance. (4.09)	3.2	4.0	15.8	34.0	42.9
3. Evaluate student performance using student achievement data. (3.56)	6.4	11.0	25.2	34.6	22.8
NAESP (N=836)					
4. Conduct teacher observations while the teacher is undertaking assessment activities, e.g., oral reading, class discussion. (4.30)	1.6 3.0	14.1	31.9	49.4	
7. Monitor student performance. (4.25)	2.8	3.4	11.1	26.8	56.0
3. Evaluate student performance using student achievement data. (3.84)	2.5	8.0	24.2	33.7	31.6

18

Table 5. Three Tasks Rated Least Important by Organizational Affiliation

Item number & Task (Mean Response)	Response Percent 1	2	3	4	5
AASA (N=473)	**Low**				**High**
19. Schedule testing. (2.01)	53.6	16.0	13.2	10.6	6.7
1. Participate in IEP development in which test scores and other assessment results are presented. (1.94)	52.6	19.5	14.4	8.6	4.9
5. Place/group students in classes. (1.80)	62.2	15.0	9.3	7.8	5.7
NASSP (N=376)					
19. Schedule testing. (2.78)	25.0	17.0	16.1	18.9	13.0
2. Use student test scores to determine eligibility for special programs (not special education) such as Chapter 1. (2.57)	26.2	22.9	25.9	18.0	7.1
20. Create a budget for testing. (2.16)	47.0	15.1	19.1	12.1	6.7
NAESP (N=836)					
11. Communicate test /assessment results to the media and general public. (2.63)	25.9	19.6	28.2	18.6	7.7
8. Evaluate teachers or school administrators using student achievement data. (2.55)	32.2	18.1	22.9	14.7	11.9
20. Create a budget for testing. (1.94)	53.0	17.4	17.1	7.4	5.1

Table 6. Three Skills and Knowledges Rated Highest on the "Have" Scale by Organizational Affiliation

Item number & Skill/Knowledge (Mean Response)	Response Percent 1	2	3	4	5
AASA (N=473)	**Low**				**High**
36. Know the purposes of different kinds of testing, e.g., achievement, IQ, diagnostic. (4.17)	.9	3.5	14.5	40.3	40.9
25. Know terminology found in reports from standardized tests, such as grade equivalent scores, percentile scores. and percentile bands. (4.05)	.9	5.0	19.9	36.7	37.6
30. Understand the concepts associated with testing, e.g., reliability, validity. (3.99)	1.3	7.8	18.8	34.6	37.4
NASSP (N=376)					
36. Know the purposes of different kinds of testing, e.g., achievement, IQ, diagnostic. (3.86)	1.4	7.0	23.5	40.5	27.6
25. Know terminology found in reports from standardized tests, such as grade equivalent scores, percentile scores. and percentile bands. (3.83)	1.1	5.9	27.3	40.1	25.7
30. Understand the concepts associated with testing, e.g., reliability, validity. (3.67)	3.0	10.0	25.6	39.9	21.6
NAESP (N=836)					
36. Know the purposes of different kinds of testing, e.g., achievement, IQ, diagnostic. (4.18)	.7	3.9	14.7	37.8	42.9
25. Know terminology found in reports from standardized tests, such as grade equivalent scores, percentile scores. and percentile bands. (4.16)	.2	2.7	18.6	38.1	40.3
30. Understand the concepts associated with testing, e.g., reliability, validity. (3.73)	2.5	9.0	26.1	37.6	24.8

Table 7. Three Skills and Knowledges Rated Lowest on the "Have" Scale by Organizational Affiliation

Item number & Skill/Knowledge (Mean Response)	Response Percent 1	2	3	4	5
AASA (N=473)	Low				High
27. Know the mechanics of writing teacher-made test; understand guidelines for test construction. (3.22)	7.3	14.3	40.4	25.5	12.5
32. Reconcile apparently conflicting assessment information when making a decision about a student. (3.21)					
28. Know how to design and conduct a performance assessment. (3.08)	8.6	19.9	36.7	24.4	10.4
NASSP (N=376)					
37. Apply assessment/measurement theory to practice. (3.26)					
28. Know how to design and conduct a performance assessment. (3.16)	9.4	19.4	37.1	24.2	9.9
29. Recognize when tests/assessments are designed consistent with accepted guidelines and standards. (3.06)	6.5	17.6	38.1	28.9	8.9
NAESP (N=836)					
27. Know the mechanics of writing teacher-made test; understand guidelines for test construction. (3.36)	3.8	13.8	36.8	33.9	11.7
29. Recognize when tests/assessments are designed consistent with accepted guidelines and standards. (3.27)	5.5	16.2	35.6	31.4	11.3
28. Know how to design and conduct a performance assessment. (3.13)	7.4	18.6	38.7	24.1	11.1

Table 8. Three Skills and Knowledges Rated Highest on the "Need" Scale by Organizational Affiliation

Item number & Skill/Knowledge (Mean Response)	Response Percent 1	2	3	4	5
AASA (N=473)	Low				High
26. Understand the appropriate linkage between curriculum content and different kinds of tests. (4.05)	1.3	5.2	16.2	42.3	35.0
25. Know terminology found in reports from standardized tests, such as grade equivalent scores, percentile scores. and percentile bands. (4.04)	1.9	4.8	18.1	38.0	37.1
36. Know the purposes of different kinds of testing, e.g., achievement, IQ, diagnostic. (4.00)	2.6	6.1	19.7	32.5	39.2
NASSP (N=376)					
25. Know terminology found in reports from standardized tests, such as grade equivalent scores, percentile scores. and percentile bands. (4.03)	1.9	4.8	17.1	40.6	35.6
36. Know the purposes of different kinds of testing, e.g., achievement, IQ, diagnostic. (4.01)	2.2	4.6	18.6	39.7	34.9
26. Understand the appropriate linkage between curriculum content and different kinds of tests. (3.97)	2.9	2.9	18.0	46.4	29.8
NAESP (N=836)					
25. Know terminology found in reports from standardized tests, such as grade equivalent scores, percentile scores. and percentile bands. (4.28)	2.3	2.8	10.3	34.2	50.4
26. Understand the appropriate linkage between curriculum content and different kinds of tests. (4.20)	1.0	2.4	14.8	39.0	42.8
36. Know the purposes of different kinds of testing, e.g., achievement, IQ, diagnostic. (4.15)	1.9	2.9	16.9	34.5	43.7

Table 9. Three Skills and Knowledges Rated Lowest on the "Need" Scale by Organizational Affiliation

Item number & Skill/Knowledge (Mean Response)	Response Percent 1	2	3	4	5
AASA (N=473)	Low				High
28. Know how to design and conduct a performance assessment. (3.36)	7.8	14.0	30.0	30.5	17.7
27. Know the mechanics of writing teacher-made test; understand guidelines for test construction. (3.23)	9.3	16.0	30.7	29.9	14.1
32. Reconcile apparently conflicting assessment information when making a decision about a student. (3.13)	16.8	15.0	22.2	30.1	15.9
NASSP (N=376)					
29. Recognize when tests/assessments are designed consistent with accepted guidelines and standards. (3.69)	4.1	7.3	25.7	40.9	22.0
28. Know how to design and conduct a performance assessment. (3.63)	4.9	8.4	27.5	37.2	22.1
35. Have a basic working knowledge of measurement theory. (3.59)	2.2	10.0	31.9	38.4	17.6
NAESP (N=836)					
28. Know how to design and conduct a performance assessment. (3.80)	3.5	6.2	25.7	36.2	28.4
27. Know the mechanics of writing teacher-made test; understand guidelines for test construction. (3.79)	2.7	6.7	24.7	41.0	25.0
35. Have a basic working knowledge of measurement theory. (3.69)	2.2	7.8	31.3	36.7	22.1